

REMARKS

Claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of claim 9, which is indicated as being allowable and now cancelled. Independent claim 13 is similarly amended. Claim 5 is amended to correct its dependency. Claims 4 and 9 are cancelled. The amendments are made for the purpose of expediting prosecution and not for patentability, and the claim cancellations are made without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to pursue subject matter of the original claims (prior to amendment) and subject matter of the canceled claims in subsequent prosecution.

The allowability of claims 4-7 and 9-12 and allowance of claims 14-16 are acknowledged.

The Office Action does not establish that claims 1 and 13 are unpatentable under 35 USC §103(a) over "Moore" (U.S. Patent No. 6,678,700 to Moore et al.) in view of "Moskowitz" (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0071556 to Moskowitz et al.) and "Kaplan" (Kaplin, IBM Cryptolopes, SuperDistribution and Digital Rights Management, 1996, IBM, Pages 1-10). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

The traversals of the claim rejections using Moore and Moskowitz as references and the arguments presented in response to those rejections are maintained and incorporated by reference in this response. The rejection is now moot, however, in view of the amendments made to the claims. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.


The Office Action does not establish that claims 2-3 and 8 are unpatentable under 35 USC §103(a) over the Moore-Moskowitz-Kaplan combination as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of "Brundrett" (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,866 to Brundrett et al.). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

The traversals of the claim rejections using Moore, Moskowitz, and Brundrett as references and the arguments presented in response to those rejections are maintained and incorporated by reference in this response. The rejection is now moot, however, in view of the amendments made to independent claim 1. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Withdrawal of the rejections and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the remarks set forth above. No extension of time is believed to be necessary for consideration of this response. However, if an extension of time is required, please consider this a petition for a sufficient number of months for consideration of this response. If there are any additional fees in connection with this response, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0996 (HPCO.024PA).

Respectfully submitted,

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390
Saint Paul, MN 55120
(651) 686-6633

By: 
Name: LeRoy D. Maunu
Reg. No.: 35,274